

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,391	11/28/2003	Hye Yong Park	K-0578	7181
34610	7590 12/13/2005		EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP			DAVIS, ROBERT B	
P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1722	
		DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/722,391	PARK ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Robert B. Davis	1722	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	S
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. D period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this commun DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the practice under the practice.	— s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters	· •	rits is
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in Apporting documents have been received in the control of the c	lication No ceived in this National Stag	le
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sum		
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 rr No(s)/Mail Date		fail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152))

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 1 of paragraph 12, "fixing panel 21" should be "fixing panel 22".

On line 1 of paragraph 19, "mod" should be "mold".

On line 2 of paragraph 20, "mod" should be "mold".

On line 2 of paragraph 59, "cab" should be "can".

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. Applicant is advised that should claim 7 be found allowable, claim 8 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claims 7 and 8 have substantially the same scope and each claim depends upon claim 1.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 1 of claim 11, "the protrusion" should be "the projection" to correspond to claim 10. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,391 Page 3

Art Unit: 1722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemaire et al (5,417,905: figures 14, 19a, 19b and 21a-21c; column 13, lines 13-65 and column 14, lines 8-19).

Lemaire et al teach an apparatus comprising a first mold (632) having a film (51) attached thereto wherein the first mold cavity has a recess (637) for receipt of the film (51) and a molding cavity (635) and a second mold (631) having a nozzle (634) having a gate, a protrusion (633) for clamping the second film (50) along with recess (636) in the molding cavity. The film (50) has a hole larger than the gate as shown in figures 20-21c. Due to the importance of the opening of the film in conjunction with the gate and the manner in which the claims have been drafted, the first and second films are considered positive structural elements of the claims. The bottom of the protrusion (633) also lines in the same plane as the bottom of film (50). The protrusion (633) serves to press film (51) against the opposite mold (632) as shown in figures 21a-21c. The language in the preamble regarding the control panel is intended use and the structure of Lemaire et al is clearly capable of molding such a panel.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,391 Page 4

Art Unit: 1722

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The remaining references illustrate the state of the art of molding between opposing substrates.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-1129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert B. Davis Primary Examiner Art Unit 1722

12/11/05